

## Brigham Young University Law School BYU Law Digital Commons

---

### Utah Supreme Court Briefs (1965 –)

---

1978

# Harold S. Sanders and Eleanor Sander v. Donn E. Cassity, Trustee, et al. : Appellant's Petition For Rehearing and Brief In Support of Petition For Rehearing

Utah Supreme Court

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc2](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2)



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Original Brief submitted to the Utah Supreme Court; funding for digitization provided by the Institute of Museum and Library Services through the Library Services and Technology Act, administered by the Utah State Library, and sponsored by the S.J. Quinney Law Library; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors. James B. Tadge; Attorney for Appellant Bill Thomas Peters; Attorney for Respondents

---

### Recommended Citation

Petition for Rehearing, *Sanders v. Cassity*, No. 15515 (Utah Supreme Court, 1978).  
[https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc2/958](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2/958)

This Petition for Rehearing is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Supreme Court Briefs (1965 –) by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu](mailto:hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu).

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE STATE OF UTAH

---

HAROLD S. SANDERS and ELEANOR SANDERS,	}	
	}	
Plaintiffs-Respondents,	}	Case NO. 15515
	}	
vs.	}	
	}	
<u>DONN E. CASSITY, Trustee, et al.,</u>	}	
	}	
Defendants-Appellant.	}	

---

APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REHEARING AND  
BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITION FOR REHEARING

---

APPEAL FROM JUDGMENT  
OF THE  
DISTRICT COURT OF THE THIRD JUDICIAL  
DISTRICT OF SUMMIT COUNTY  
STATE OF UTAH  
Honorable James S. Sawaya, Judge

---

JAMES B. TADJE  
ROMNEY, NELSON & CASSITY  
136 South Main Street  
Suite 404 Kearns Building  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
Attorneys for Appellant

BILL THOMAS PETERS  
TIBBALS & STATEN  
400 Chancellor Building  
220 South 2nd East  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Attorneys for Respondents

FILED

OCT 31 1978

Clerk, Supreme Court, Utah

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE STATE OF UTAH

---

HAROLD S. SANDERS and ELEANOR SANDERS,	}	
	}	
Plaintiffs-Respondents,	}	Case NO. 15515
	}	
vs.	}	
	}	
<u>DONN E. CASSITY, Trustee, et al.,</u>	}	
	}	
Defendants-Appellant.	}	

---

APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REHEARING AND  
BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITION FOR REHEARING

---

APPEAL FROM JUDGMENT  
OF THE  
DISTRICT COURT OF THE THIRD JUDICIAL  
DISTRICT OF SUMMIT COUNTY  
STATE OF UTAH  
Honorable James S. Sawaya, Judge

---

JAMES B. TADJE  
ROMNEY, NELSON & CASSITY  
136 South Main Street  
Suite 404 Kearns Building  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
Attorneys for Appellant

BILL THOMAS PETERS  
TIBBALS & STATEN  
400 Chancellor Building  
220 South 2nd East  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Attorneys for Respondents

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PETITION FOR REHEARING	1
APPELLANT'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR REHEARING	4
POINT I	
THE SUPREME COURT ERRED BY ASSUMING THAT LEODA DUNHAM WAS A QUALIFIED HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, AND THERE- FORE ENTITLED TO A HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION, AT THE TIME THAT APPELLANT'S JUDGMENT WAS DOCKETED. THIS ASSUMED FACT HAS NO FOUNDATION IN THE RECORD ON APPEAL NOR IN ANY EVIDENTIARY MATERIAL SUBMITTED IN THESE PRO- CEEDINGS.	4
POINT II	
THE SUPREME COURT ERRED BY IMPROPERLY PLACING A DUTY UPON APPELLANT TO CONTEST THE DECLARED VALUE OF THE HOMESTEAD PROPERTY OF LEODA DUNHAM, AS SET FORTH IN HER HOMESTEAD DECLARATION, AT THE TIME THE DECLAR- ATION WAS RECORDED. THE IMPROPER IMPOSITION OF THIS DUTY WAS THE BASIS FOR THE COURT'S FINDING THAT APPELLANT WAIVED HIS RIGHT TO CONTEST THE DECLARED VALUE OF THE PROPERTY IN THESE PROCEEDINGS.	7
POINT III	
THE SUPREME COURT ERRED BY FAILING TO ADDRESS A MATERIAL ISSUE ON THIS APPEAL, I.E. WHETHER LEODA DUNHAM RETAINED HER HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION OR CONVEYED IT TO RESPONDENTS.	11
SUMMARY	12

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Evans v. Jensen</u> , 168 P. 762 (Utah 1917) . . . .	4,5
<u>Giesy-Walker Co. v. Briggs</u> , 162 P. 876 (Utah 1916). 6,7	
U.C.A., 1953, 28-1-16 . . . . .	8,9

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE STATE OF UTAH

---

HAROLD S. SANDERS and ELEANOR SANDERS,	}	
	}	
Plaintiffs-Respondents,	}	Case No. 15515
	}	
vs.	}	
	}	
<u>DONN E. CASSITY, Trustee, et al.,</u>	}	
	}	
Defendants-Appellant.	}	

---

PETITION FOR REHEARING

The Supreme Court of the State of Utah erred in its opinion filed October 13, 1978, in the above entitled matter as follows:

1. The Supreme Court erred by assuming that Leoda Dunham was a qualified head of household, and therefore entitled to a homestead exemption at the time that appellant's judgment was docketed. This assumed fact has no foundation in the record on appeal nor in any evidentiary material submitted in these proceedings.

2. The Supreme Court erred by improperly placing a duty upon appellant to contest the declared value of the homestead property of Leoda Dunham, as set forth in her homestead declaration, at the time the declaration was recorded. The improper imposition of this duty was the basis

for the Court's finding that appellant waived his right to contest the declared value of the property in these proceedings.

3. The Supreme Court erred by failing to address a material issue on this appeal, i.e. whether Leoda Dunham retained her homestead exemption or conveyed it to respondents.

WHEREFORE, appellant petitions the Utah Supreme Court to reconsider its opinion in the above entitled case and to rule in favor of appellant by holding:

a. That appellant's judgment lien attached to Leoda Dunham's property before she was a qualified head of household, and consequently the subsequent declaration of homestead had no affect upon the judgment lien.

b. That appellant had no duty to contest the declared value of the homestead property, as set forth in Leoda Dunham's homestead declaration, and has consequently not waived his right to have the true value determined. If necessary, this matter should be remanded for a determination of the true value of the homestead property.

c. That the court erred in holding that it need not determine whether Leoda Dunham retained or

conveyed her homestead interest when the value of the homestead property at the time of the conveyance thereof has not been determined.

RESPECTFULLY, submitted this 30 day of October, 1978.



JAMES B. TADJE

ROMNEY, NELSON & CASSITY  
136 South Main Street  
Suite 404 Kearns Building  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101